

nominees. Let them stand up and say what they think. Let them vote the way they want to vote. I might say to my very good friend from Mississippi that my colleague, Senator BURNS, a Republican from the State of Montana, supports this nominee. He supports this nominee. If you have bipartisan support for our nominee, Don Molloy, I see no reason why he should not be added to that list of four.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, there has been objection to this point to this particular nominee. I do not know him. I do not know his record. I am not on the Judiciary Committee. I can only say that we have not been able to get any other than these four approved to this point. Maybe there is some problem there. I do not know. Maybe there is not.

I can sympathize with the Senator, because I remember one time that my State of Mississippi agreed to go along with a nominee from Louisiana, who was particularly well qualified to be a member of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals—basically, a Mississippi position. Because there was such a uniquely qualified nominee, a former Congressman and Governor that we withheld with the insistence that it be a nominee from our State. So that nomination went forward, and then it languished, and it laid there, and it seemed to be objected to. Finally, the term ended, or that session of the Congress, whatever that was—maybe the 98th session. At any rate, there was never an explanation of what the problem was. There was an objection by the Democrats to this fine man, who clearly had judicial temperament, was highly rejected, ethical, a former Congressman and Governor and, yet, it just stayed there and never was considered.

So I understand how the Senator feels about this. But it is a unique thing to the Senate to make the recommendations to Presidents for the Federal district judges, as well as appellate courts, even though appellate courts are treated a little differently than Federal district judges. It is also a unique Senate prerogative to have an objection to a judge. Obviously, it can come from some other State, some member of the Judiciary Committee—who knows? Sometimes it is very difficult to find out exactly what the problem is. But they have a way, in many instances, of working themselves out.

Again, the majority leader has said to the minority leader that he would like to move as many of these as possible.

Mr. BAUCUS. I can help the Senator move one more right now. That is my suggestion. That is helping the leader. He can move one more.

Mr. LOTT. We do not have that one cleared and the other 12. But we do have four cleared. When those are done, we will try some others. I make one last plea to the Senator. I believe that if he would let these four go, it would help break down the dike, and we would see others move.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of my very good friend. We simply have heard no good reason why Don Molloy should not be on the calendar.

It is with great reluctance that I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Iowa for allowing us to have this exchange in an effort to try to clear some judicial nominations.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Iowa.

#### CHINA MOST-FAVORED-NATION STATUS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, earlier today the Senate Finance Committee heard testimony on the issue of most-favored-nation trade policy for China. As you know Mr. President, the President of the United States, President Clinton, on May 20 announced that China would be granted most-favored-nation status for another year. This is an annual determination made in the case of China. For the other 100 and some nations that have most-favored-nation trade status with us it is more on a permanent basis. It does not have to be annually like it is for China.

I might say, too, for the benefit of my colleagues that there are only about five or six countries that would be called major trading partners, or potential major trading partners that do not have most-favored-nation status. So I am not sure that the terminology is very good when it really kind of refers to normal trading status between the United States and any other country. But it has been titled like this for decades. So it sounds like maybe really more than what it really is. But the President made that decision.

I wanted to announce my support of the President's decision. So we are going to enter a period of time here where Congress debates whether or not the President is right to have granted most-favored-nation status to China, and also we will do that through a resolution of disapproval of the President's action. So if the resolution of disapproval does not pass the Congress then, of course, the President's actions will stand. If it would pass Congress by a majority vote but the President would veto, which you would assume that he would, then presumably unless there are votes to override—which means two-thirds majority—that the President's action would still stand.

So I think it is fair to assume that regardless of the annual exercise we go

through, regardless of the motion of disapproval being approved, in the final analysis there will not be a two-thirds vote to override the President's actions. So China will have most-favored-nation status for another year.

I personally believe—and I support, of course—that the President's decision should and will be upheld. But there is a lot of sentiment against China on Capitol Hill, and recent developments in our relationship with China has not helped China's chances of success in fighting the motion of disapproval.

Most recently on trade issues in regard to China our United States Trade Representative announced sanctions against China to the tune of \$2 billion. These sanctions will take effect on June 17 unless China comes into compliance with the bilateral agreement on intellectual property rights that was reached in 1995. In response to our own Government's announcement of sanctions against China, they in turn said that they would levy 100 percent tariffs on many U.S. exports. These include agricultural products such as cotton, beef, chicken, and vegetable oils.

So it appears that we could be on the verge of a trade war with one of our major agricultural export markets. I want to reflect on this issue by briefly discussing how we got into this position, and what it means for China's chances on MFN.

Mr. President, as you know, the Clinton administration's position on how to deal with China has never been very clear. In fact, I suppose you could put it in a class with a lot of other issues that the President has taken positions on in the past. He has changed his view on this one as well.

In addition, since he has been President, I can say he has had no long-term view on what a relationship with China ought to be. Some have said that the President seems to make policy according to the last person he has spoken to on a given day. That has been a very general comment about the President. But it is one, if you look at specific actions on China, that I think you can apply even more specifically to our China policy.

In 1992, when he was a Presidential candidate, Bill Clinton harshly criticized the Bush administration for being soft on human rights in China. Candidate Clinton vowed at that time to condition China's most-favored-nation status on—these are his words—“respect for human rights, political liberalization, and responsible international conduct.”

That is what the President said was wrong with President Bush's position on China.

Just 2 years later, President Clinton favored separating human rights from most-favored-nation status, and he favored that year granting China MFN status, as the Bush administration had done, and as the Reagan administration had done. And it even goes back beyond that.